

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/803,407	03/17/2004	Mikio Shiraishi	16869N-110100US	5560	
20350 7	590 06/29/2005		EXAM	INER	
TÖWNSEND	AND TOWNSEND	BLACKMAN, ROCHELLE ANN J			
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER					
EIGHTH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SAN FRANCI	ISCO, CA 94111-3834	4 ·	2851		

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

71	
4	

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/803,407	SHIRAISHI, MIKIO			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Rochelle Blackman	2851			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address -			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 Ap	oril 2005.				
<u> </u>	action is non-final.	·			
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or					
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 3/17/04 & 4/13/05 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected frawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). 					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Po 6) Other:				
Patent and Timdework Office					

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 6, and 11 are objected to because of the following informalities: claim 1 recites the limitation "the cooling air path" in line 9 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claims 6 and 11 appear to recite the same limitations, with the exception of limitation, "said cooling air is varied" recited in claim 6 and limitation, "said cooling air is selectively varied" recited in claim 11.

Applicant is advised to choose one of the above limitations to recite in claims 6 and 11 to maintain consistency in the claims. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-4, 8, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Onishi et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/008852) in view of Shikata et al. (U.S. Patent No;. 6,152,699).

Regarding claim 1, Onishi discloses providing a projection type display device (see 101 of FIG. 10 or 106 of FIG. 12), comprising: a light source unit (see 122 of FIGS. 10 or 12; a cooling fan (see 132 of FIG. 10 or 172 of FIG. 12) which cools said light source unit; a light valve (see 123a-c of FIGS. 10 or 12) which modulates a flux of light emanated from said light source unit; and a projection lens (see 121 of FIGS. 10 or 12) which projects light modulated by said light valve; wherein the cooling fan provides a cooling air separated from the light valve to cool only the light source unit (see 103 of FIG. 10 or 171 of FIG. 12).

Regarding claim 2, Onishi discloses a duct (see 133 of FIG. 10 or 173 of FIG. 12) which has said light source unit disposed therein, which duct forms said cooling air path together with the cooling fan (see 103 of FIG. 10 or 171 of FIG. 12).

Regarding claims 1, 3, 4, 8, and 9, Ohnishi discloses the claimed invention including a cooling fan (see 31 of FIG. 2) disposed at an air inlet (see 11 of FIGS. 2 and 3) which serves as an air flow generating means capable of driving or rotating in forward and reverse directions to selectively generate an intake air flow Fa and an exhaust air flow Fb in FIG. 3. However, Ohnishi does not disclose the cooling air path direction of "cooling fan" 132 or 172 being is "selectively varied" and "changing a direction of

rotation" of "cooling fan" 132 or 172 between forward and backward" or "varying the rotation" of "cooling fan" 132 or 172.

Shikata teaches providing a cooling fan (see 17 of FIG. 3) disposed in a cooling air path formed by an air outlet aperture or "exhaust" (see 19 of FIG. 3) and an air intake aperture (see 18 of FIG. 3) of an apparatus (see 9 of FIG. 3) comprising heat-generating components, where the cooling air path direction is selectively varied and the direction of rotation of the cooling fan is changed between forward and backward or rotation of the cooling fan is varied (see col. 2, lines 5-11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time was made to vary the cooling air path direction of "cooling fan" 132 or 172 and/or change the direction of rotation of "cooling fan" 132 or 172 between forward and backward or vary the rotation of "cooling fan" 132 or 172 in the "projection type display device" of the Ohnishi reference, as taught by Shikata for the purpose of blowing off dust that may gather on the air-intake aperture, thus preventing the reduction of the amount of air drawn into the housing, which prevents the heat-generating components from being efficiently cooled (see col. 1, lines 38-40 and col. 2, lines 5-11).

2. Claims 5-7 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Onishi et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/008852) in view of Shikata et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,152,699) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Fuse et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,280,038).

Onishi and Shikata disclose the claimed invention except for "wherein said cooling fan is provided at substantially a center portion of a casing of said projection type display device"; and "wherein a plurality of cooling fan removal locations are provided in said cooling air path and the direction said cooling air is varied or selectively varied by selecting a specific cooling fan removal location and mounting therein said cooling fan".

Fuse teaches providing a cooling fan (see 50 of FIG. 8) for cooling a light source (see 1 of FIG. 8) is provided at substantially a center portion of a casing of said projection type display device (see location of 50 in FIG. 8); wherein a plurality of cooling fan removal locations (the plurality of cooling fan removal locations is considered to be the location of 50 in FIG. 8 and the *another place* in col. 8, lines 13-17) are provided in said cooling air path and the direction said cooling air is varied or selectively varied by selecting a specific cooling fan removal location and mounting therein said cooling fan.

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the cooling fan of the combined Onishi and Shikata reference at substantially a center portion of the casing of the projection type display device and/or providing the cooling air path with a plurality of cooling fan removal portions, as taught by Fuse for the purpose of increasing or decreasing the amount of and/or blowing force of cooling air received by the light source, thus efficiently cooling the light source.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rochelle Blackman whose telephone number is (571) 272-2113. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-2258. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/803,407 Page 7

Art Unit: 2851

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RB

JUDY NGUYEN

SORY PATENT EXAMINER